MEETING

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM

BOARD OF ADMINISTRATION

RISK AND AUDIT COMMITTEE

OPEN SESSION

ROBERT F. CARLSON AUDITORIUM

LINCOLN PLAZA NORTH

400 P STREET

SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

TUESDAY, JUNE 20, 2017 11:04 A.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER LICENSE NUMBER 10063

APPEARANCES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS:

Ms. Dana Hollinger, Chairperson

Mr. Ron Lind, Vice Chairperson

Mr. Rob Feckner

Mr. Richard Gillihan

Ms. Priya Mathur

Mr. Bill Slaton

Ms. Betty Yee, represented by Mr. Alan Lofaso

BOARD MEMBERS:

Mr. Henry Jones, Vice President

Mr. John Chiang, represented by Ms. Jeree Glasser-Hedrick

Mr. J.J. Jelincic

STAFF:

Ms. Marcie Frost, Chief Executive Officer

Mr. Matthew Jacobs, General Counsel

Ms. Marlene Timberlake-D'Adamo, Interim Chief Financial Officer

Ms. Beliz Chappuie, Chief Auditor

Mr. Forrest Grimes, Chief Risk Officer

Ms. Carrie Lewis, Committee Secretary

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

ALSO PRESENT:

Mr. David Bullock, Macias, Gini & O'Connell

Ms. Debbie Chan, Macias, Gini & O'Connell

Ms. Caroline Walsh, Macias, Gini & O'Connell

	INDEX	
	I N D E A	PAGE
1.	Call to Order and Roll Call	1
2.	Executive Report	1
3.	Consent Items Action Consent Items: a. Approval of the February 13, 2017 Risk & Audit Committee Meeting Minutes	3
4.	Consent Items Information Consent Items: a. 2017 Annual Calendar Review b. 2018 Annual Calendar Review c. Draft Agenda for the September 19, 2017 Risk & Audit Committee Meeting d. Quarterly Status Report - Office of Audit Services e. Quarterly Status Report - Enterprise Risk Management f. Quarterly Status Report - Enterprise Compliance Activity	3
Action Agenda Items		
5.	Enterprise Compliance a. 2017-18 Enterprise Compliance Plan	4
6.	Enterprise Risk Management a. 2017-18 Enterprise Risk Management Plan	12
7.	Office of Audit Services a. 2017-18 Office of Audit Services Plan b. Independent Auditor's 2017 Annual Plan	14 21
Information Agenda Items		
8.	Enterprise Risk Management a. Semi-Annual Enterprise Risk Reports	49
9.	Summary of Committee Direction	54
10.	Public Comment	55
Adjournment		55
Reporter's Certificate		56

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: I'll call to order the Risk and Audit Committee. Yeah, we've got to get that's 3 4 true. Okay. Could the rest of Committee members come 5 forward. Should we wait for Rob? 6 7 Is Rob coming? 8 Okay. First item of business is call to order 9 and roll call. 10 COMMITTEE SECRETARY LEWIS: Dana Hollinger? CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Here. 11 COMMITTEE SECRETARY LEWIS: Ron Lind? 12 13 VICE CHAIRPERSON LIND: Here. 14 COMMITTEE SECRETARY LEWIS: Rob Feckner? 15 Richard Gillihan? COMMITTEE MEMBER GILLIHAN: Here. 16 17 COMMITTEE SECRETARY LEWIS: Priya Mathur? COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Hello. 18 19 COMMITTEE SECRETARY LEWIS: Bill Slaton? 20 COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Here. COMMITTEE SECRETARY LEWIS: Alan Lofaso --21 ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER LOFASO: Here. 22 23 COMMITTEE SECRETARY LEWIS: -- for Betty Yee? 24 CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Great. Second item of

business is the Executive Report by Marlene

25

Timberlake-D'Adamo.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: Good morning. Thank you, Madam Chair, Vice
Chair and Committee members. Marlene Timberlake-D'Adamo,
CalPERS team member. I would like to provide you with a
preview of today's Risk and Audit Committee.

First, on consent, we have our standing items:
2017 and 2018 calendars, and a draft agenda for the
September 2017 meeting. On consent we also have provided
quarterly status reports for the Office of Audit Services,
And Enterprise Risk Management, and Enterprise Compliance.

Moving to the action addenda item, today we are providing you with the annual plans for Compliance, Risk Management, and Audit. Additionally, our independent auditor, Macias, Gini & O'Connell, are here to present to you their 2017-18 audit plan.

On Item 8a comes to you as an information item from Forrest Grimes, CalPERS Chief Risk Officer. He will provide an update on the Enterprise Risk Management reports, including the Board risk appetite statements, which is the next step in refining the enterprise risk management framework.

The next Risk and Audit Committee meeting is scheduled for September 14th, 2017, and includes external audit fees, third-party valuation and certification of the

3

```
Judges' Retirement System, the Judges' Retirement System
1
    II, the Legislators' Retirement System, 1959 Survivor
 2
3
    Benefit Program all as of June 30, 2016, and the annual
 4
    Compliance Report for 2016-17.
5
             Thank you, Madam Chair. This concludes my
6
             I would be happy to take questions.
   report.
7
             CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Thank you.
8
             Any questions?
9
             I also want to note for the record that Henry
10
    Jones is here, and Jeree --
             ACTING BOARD MEMBER GLASSER-HEDRICK:
11
             Glasser-Hedrick.
12
13
             CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: -- Glasser-Hedrick is
14
   here, and J.J. Jelincic is here.
15
             Action consent items. Approval of the February
16
    13th Risk and Audit Committee minutes. I will entertain a
17
   motion to approve.
18
             COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: So moved.
19
             VICE CHAIRPERSON LIND: Second.
20
             CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Motion made by Priya
21
   Mathur, favor -- seconded by Ron Lind.
             All in favor of the motion?
22
23
             (Ayes.)
2.4
             CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Approved.
             So on 4a, or the consent items, I've not received
25
```

1 | any requests to remove anything from the Consent Item.

So we can move on to Item 5, which is Enterprise Compliance, Ms. D'Adamo.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

5 D'ADAMO: Thank you.

2.4

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: The 2017 and 2018

Enterprise Compliance Plan.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.)

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: Thank you. I need to get the -- I always have
trouble working this.

Okay. Thank you. This is the 2017-18 Enterprise Compliance Annual Plan.

--000--

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: And this is -- moving to slide 3, this is the
third year of our five-year plan. In years one and two,
we really focused on building and strengthening items, and
then in year three through five, if you noticed we're
looking at maturing processes and protocols, rolling out
standards, and improving compliance principles and
culture.

This slide is one that you guys have seen several times, and it really sets the framework for the work that

we're doing as a result of our five-year plan, which was approved originally in 2015.

--000--

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: On slide 3, this is another slide that you have
seen a couple of times. This is essentially looking at
the seven compliance elements, and then providing
information about our focus areas for 2017-18. And if you
look in the bottom right corner, the caption is expand the
focus areas for 2017-18.

Here, we're going to be working on program area compliance design, policy and procedure standards, program compliance monitoring, leadership and Board compliance reporting, and education and training programs.

And I'll note that slides 6, 7, 8, and 9 actually go into a little bit more detail about the specific tests that we're going to be undertaking as a result of our '17-'18 year. And what we're really trying to show is that from the broad framework, we have a lot of things that we're trying to do, and we're methodically going through year by year and chipping away, and improving, and adding to those things.

I will note also that the program itself is an iterative process. And so what we do is we improve things. We go back, we improve them some more. We

continue to focus on the things that we believe are really important to helping us continue our program.

--000--

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: Slide 5 is essentially a snapshot, an overview
really, of the activities that we're going to be doing.
On the left side are the program areas. And then for the
middle and right side, we're giving you some information
about some of focus areas, as well as where we think we
are in the overall body of work as it relates to that
focus area.

And so our four focus areas for '17-'18 are that ethics programs, policies and delegation management, monitoring and oversight, and communications, education, and reporting. And then as I mentioned in the middle, we actually list some topics or some tasks that we're going to be doing as a result of the time that we're spending on those focus areas.

And I should note, I know others have said this too, if, at any point, you have a question, just stop me and we can -- we can talk about it.

--000--

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

D'ADAMO: On slide 6, we're getting into the specific

focus areas. So conflicts of interest -- on the ethics

side, conflicts of interests, ethics laws and policies, as well as work on the ethics helpline management.

--000--

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: On slide 7, we're going to be looking at
delegations and policy management. And that really is the
bottom, I'll say, the framework for our Governance
Program. And so we really in looking at the Compliance
Program, we're really focusing on governance, which we
believe starts with the delegations and the policies.

--000--

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: And on slide 8, we're looking at compliance
monitoring and oversight. And here, we've been working
with this going on, I want to say, two years now in terms
of our embedded Compliance Program, where we are
designating liaisons and rolling it out gradually to the
program areas, but really working with them to help them
provide oversight and monitoring at the level.

And it's probably a good time to note that the embedded compliance liaisons are really our first line of defense. And as you know, we have a three lines of defense model. The first line is the program areas, second line would be your enterprise, risk, and compliance, and third line would be your audit.

And so the three lines together, we hope provide a tremendous level of assurance in terms of the work that we're doing. And so the embedded Compliance Program that we're doing is really working with those liaisons to help them become compliance liaisons, understand compliance, and then also do reporting back up through the enterprise, so that we can provide you guys with the information that you need to make the decisions that we ask you to make.

The other part of the embedded -- of the Compliance Monitoring and Oversight Program is actual enterprise compliance monitoring and oversight.

--000--

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: And then for slide 9, we're looking at
communication, education, and reporting. And these are
items that, in our program, are really important, because
they really provide the reinforcement. They provide the
culture. They provide a lot of the things that we need as
compliance professionals to make sure that the program is
working, that folks have recourse if they need it, that
there's monitoring that's being done, that there's
education and training. And the information, as I
mentioned before, it being provided to you that you need
in order to make your decisions.

So here, we've listed communication, education

and compliance reporting as some of the things that we're going to be working on in 2017-18.

--000--

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

D'ADAMO: And that's actually a wrap-up of the program

itself. On slide 10, we've sort of summarized the wrap-up

of the annual plan. So we're maturing our processes and

protocols in the areas of oversight and monitoring. We're

rolling out standards and frameworks, in addition to the

program areas. We're continuing to mature compliance

principles, standards, and our culture. We're developing

knowledgeable compliance liaisons and additional program

areas. We're improving our compliance capabilities that

result in our strong internal control processes, and we're

expanding and enhancing reporting to include program

operations.

I believe that actually ends my presentation. So if you'd like, I will take any questions.

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Thank you.

20 And I want to note for the record that Mr.

21 Feckner is in attendance.

2.4

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: He's not on your committee.

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Pardon?

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Go ahead.

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Okay.

Thank you very much for that very detailed report.

Yes, Mr. Lind.

VICE CHAIRPERSON LIND: Thank you, Marlene. I wanted to direct you to page seven of the report. I just want to hear a little bit more about the policy management part of this. I'm very interested in the policy development training course, because I believe, you know, as a Board -- and I think all boards have this same issue, we need some maybe reminders or guidance around our roles, around policy rather than procedure.

So can you talk a little bit more about where we're moving with this?

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: Yes. So we have a dedicated group within the
Enterprise Compliance that focuses on policy management.
And this group has for, I want to say two years now, this
year completing being the first full year, been really
working on strengthening our policy management.

And so what we mean by that is essentially taking a holistic look at the way that we do policies, that -- how people are engaged in policies, the impact of policies, as well as creating mechanisms for policies to be housed, so that they're easily found, and also making

sure that policies do what they need to do in terms of the how and the what.

And so what I say about that is making sure that they answer all the questions that someone would need to have answered, if they're going to have a policy that applies to them. And this body of work was really a lot of work. I have to give Sally Lee and her team a lot of credit for this, because it was a really big effort where they actually went around to all the divisions and, you know, talked to them about these are the policies that we have for you.

Are these the right policies, are the not?

Should these be procedures? Let's have conversations around what's the policy and a procedure. How do you make sure that a policy has the impact that you want it to have? What are the questions that people might have as a result of this? Who are the stakeholders that are impacted when you do a policy?

We don't -- we don't -- we don't want it where someone actually creates a policy, but nobody knows about it. And so we've created this whole mechanism where, when a policy is created, not only is it created, but people are aware of it, they get a chance to know about it ahead of time, and we even actually take that work up to the executives as well, and let them know about policies that

are coming down the pike.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

13

14

16

18

19

25

The idea being that there should never be a surprise, and that policies should really be thoroughly vetted, when they're created, because they really -- they create that framework, that governance level that is really every -- everything else is sort of underpinned by.

VICE CHAIRPERSON LIND: Great. Thanks.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

D'ADAMO: So thank you for that question.

VICE CHAIRPERSON LIND: Look forward to hearing
more. Thank you.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Thank you.

Seeing no further questions, I will entertain a motion to approve the --

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Move approval.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER LOFASO: Second.

17 CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Motion made by Mathur,

seconded by Alfon -- Lofaso.

All in favor?

20 (Ayes.)

21 CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Motion passes.

Okay. Next, Mr. Grimes on Enterprise Risk

23 Management. The 2017 and 2018 Enterprise Risk Management

24 | Plan.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was

presented as follows.)

2.4

CHIEF RISK OFFICER GRIMES: Thank you, Madam Chair. Nice to see you.

We don't have slides for this -- this one.

Nice to see Committee members and Board members. Pending your approval, the Risk team will have three main areas of focus in the coming year. The first will be continuing facilitation of the Asset Liability Management Program. Secondly, we want to continue to mature the enterprise risk management framework. And thirdly, we want to continue to drive risk awareness and cultivate a risk intelligent organization through both stakeholder engagement, as well as team member education.

And these are -- have been outlined for you in the memorandum that you have. However, I certainly would want to ask you if you have questions or want to drill down deeper into any of these three areas. And I'd like to engage you in that conversation, if you so choose.

Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Thank you for your report. I see no questions, so I will entertain a motion to approve.

VICE CHAIRPERSON LIND: Move.

COMMITTEE MEMBER FECKNER: Second.

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Motion made by Lind,

seconded by Feckner.

So now, we'll move on to 7, Office of -- pardon me.

All in favor?

(Ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Okay. Motion grant -- motion approved.

Now, we'll move on to Item 7, Office of Audit Services, Beliz Chappuie, on the 20 -- reporting on the 2017-2018 Office of Audit Services plan.

CHIEF AUDITOR CHAPPUIE: Good morning, Madam
Chair, members of the Committee. Beliz Chappuie CalPERS
team member.

Agenda Item 7a is an action item. Staff is requesting Risk and Audit Committee to approve Office of Audit Services proposed audit plan for fiscal year 2017-18. Office of Audit Services charter requires the Chief Auditor to submit, at least annually, an internal audit plan to the Committee and the Board for review and approval.

Also, the internal auditing standards require the Chief Auditor to establish a risk-based audit plan to determine the priorities of the internal audit activity consistent with the organization's goals.

In conducting the risk assessment, Office of

Audit Services, as the third line of defense, coordinated its efforts with the second line of defense, the Enterprise Compliance Division and the Enterprise Risk Management Division.

Staff interviewed executive and senior management teams, and sought input from the Board members through surveys. Staff also incorporated their knowledge through prior audits and findings, and took into consideration the financial statement, and any other external audit findings. Office of Audit services has two audit programs, internal audits and public agency reviews.

To identify the internal audit assignments and activities, staff established an audit universe of all possible audits that could be performed for the organization. Then staff evaluated multiple risk factors to rank the activities. These risk factors included the activity's contribution to the organization's goals, changes in the operations and regulations, impact on the financial statements, implemented controls, and prior audit findings.

For the public agency reviews, staff performed the risk assessment to identify high risk compliance areas for review. Office of Audit Services plans to complete four review cycles during fiscal year 2017-18 covering one compliance area per each cycle. Using data analytics,

staff will identify high risk agencies for these compliance areas for review.

Our goal is to identify approximately 60 agencies for each compliance activity selected for review. During the current fiscal year, we implemented our focused review approach and completed four review cycles covering 246 agencies. We're currently issued the reports for cycle three, and preparing draft reports for cycle four.

In preparing the internal audit plan, Office of Audit Services also allocated resources to the consulting engagements and special projects in order to provide assistance to management.

In addition, Office of Audit Services coordinates contracted external audits and reviews, including the financial statement audit, GASB 68 and 75 audits, real assets and other specialty investment audits, and actuarial, valuation, and certification services.

As required by the internal auditing standards, we'll remain responsive to the changes in the organization's business rules, operations, program, systems, and controls, and we'll review and update audit plan for fiscal year 2017-18, as necessary.

Any modification to the audit plan will be communicated to the Committee through the quarterly status reports.

This concludes my presentation, and I'm happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Thank you very much.

Seeing no questions, I will entertain a motion to approve the 2017-2018 audit.

COMMITTEE MEMBER GILLIHAN: Moved.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER LOFASO: Second.

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Okay. Motion made by Gillihan and seconded by Lofaso.

All in favor of the --

VICE CHAIRPERSON LIND: J.J. wants to speak.

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Oh, I'm sorry. I'm

sorry. Okay. Questions on the motion.

Mr. Jelincic.

2.4

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Yeah, one of the -- sorry about that.

One of the issues I have is an issue we've had before. Are we doing enough audits? I mean, if -- when I look at the number of audits we're going to do divided by the number of employers, even assuming we did them all randomly, it would only take us 100 years, since we actually repeat and focus on some where we have problems. You know, if you cut that in half, it takes 200 years.

So my question is, do you have enough auditors, and are we doing enough audits?

CHIEF AUDITOR CHAPPUIE: Thank you for the question. That's always the ongoing demand that we can -- unfortunately, we can't perform 100 percent of the agencies to include in our audits. However, we have improved our approach, since then. We implemented our approach this year, so it is risk based in compliance with the auditing standards. And we doubled our capacity since last year without increasing any number of staff.

However, we're are evaluating our approach, especially -- I'm assuming your question is specific to the public agency reviews. So at the end of this year, we will assess and reconsider if we need to expand the number of auditors we have to increase the number of reviews we complete.

However, if you look at other agencies, STRS, their audit -- internal audit organization, I am fully aware that they're not conducting as many audits as we do.

So the idea of auditing is also risk based and sample based, not necessarily 100 percent reviews of every agency. So with that respect, as long as we target and identify those areas that are high risk, utilizing the data analytics, which we are doing, we are targeting those areas in a more intelligent and knowledge based reviews. So my opinion, I think we are hitting all those areas that are of concern.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: And I'm aware of the way you've restructured who we audit and doing focused audits. And I think that is a good use of resources.

But, you know, quite frankly if people know the auditors are looking, they tend to be a little more cautious. And so I would hope as you go forward, you at least think about getting to the point where we, on average, audit everybody every 50 years.

Thank you.

CHIEF AUDITOR CHAPPUIE: Thank you. We will definitely take that into consideration.

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Thank you.

Mr. Slaton.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Thank you, Madam Chair. I've been an IRS taxpayer for, I don't know how to do the math, a long number of years. I've never been audited. It doesn't mean I don't pay attention to the risk of an audit, and, you know, file my taxes appropriately.

So, you know, I think the measurement of how long it takes to audit everybody, I'm not sure really bears on the issue. And I think the risk assessment is really the important issue, the same way the IRS does. It's a risk assessment.

So -- but my question is, it seems like the process is either audit or no audit. And my question is,

is there, for lack of a better term, junior audits? Are there areas where we can go into and be effective at going after certain areas, as opposed to conducting a full audit, and therefore get more breadth out of our existing staff?

CHIEF AUDITOR CHAPPUIE: And I think that's what we're trying to accomplish with our current reviews.

I'm -- I'm not sure if you have had a chance to review some of the reports we issued recently. One was special compensation review, and the next one that is coming out is related to contracting and active rate plans. So that was more of a scope like you were describing.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Of stratifying, based on issue as opposed to based on

CHIEF AUDITOR CHAPPUIE: Exactly. So -- but we can continue to have these discussions definitely, especially I would like to hear more input from the Board about the topics that you would be interested in us reviewing.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: So that's taking the topic and then selecting agencies --

CHIEF AUDITOR CHAPPUIE: Exactly.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: -- to go after that particular topic

CHIEF AUDITOR CHAPPUIE: Exactly. Exactly.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Okay. So they aren't done as a -- is that more typical, rather than a quote full audit? Is that the more typical approach?

CHIEF AUDITOR CHAPPUIE: It's still review. It's not a full compliance review like we used to conduct in the past, so it's more narrow scoped. So we are targeting a compliance topic, but then increasing our coverage by including more agencies in the review.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Good. Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Okay. No further questions, so we had the motion made by Gillihan and seconded by Slaton.

So all in favor of the motion? (Ayes.)

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Okay. Motion passes.

7b, the Independent Auditor's 2017 Annual Plan.

CHIEF AUDITOR CHAPPUIE: Good morning, Madam Chair and members of the Committee. Beliz Chappuie, CalERPS team member.

Agenda Item 7b is an action item. Staff is requesting Risk and Audit Committee to approve the Board's independent auditor MGO's audit plan for CalPERS financial statements audit for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2017.

The presentation is to provide the Risk and Audit

Committee the opportunity to hear from the independent auditor regarding their scope of services and deliverables for the financial statement audit, and to enable the Committee to ask questions.

Presenting with me today are staff from MGO,
Caroline Walsh, the engagement partner; David Bullock, the
consulting partner; and, Debbie Chan, Director.

With that, I would like to turn it over to Caroline, David, and Debbie to present their audit plan.

MS. WALSH: Madam Chair, Vice Chair, members of the Committee, Good morning. It is still good morning.

I wanted to take this opportunity to communicate to you something that's very important for your governance over the financial statements of CalPERS. And I wanted to let you know that we very much appreciate that our contract was renewed with CalPERS to perform the work, and we hope to serve you with the same excellence and responsive service that we have in the past.

(Thereupon an overhead presentation was presented as follows.).

MS. WALSH: With that said, do we -- do we operate the slides or... So we wanted to take a few moments to provide you with an overview of the audit process, and hopefully just hit the salient points of how we conduct our audits.

--000--

MS. WALSH: So I am going to communicate a little bit about our engagement team, our depth of experience, the scope of our services and what deliverables you can expect. And then also the independent auditor's responsibilities. And I will touch briefly on management's responsibilities for the financial statements. Debbie Chan will speak a little bit about our audit timeline. We're in the process of doing the audit right now, and she will let you know what the key milestones are.

And David Bullock will talk briefly about our audit approach, and how it's risk based, and what areas we believe are significant and of higher risk with respect to your financial statements.

And then we'll talk a little bit about just a couple accounting pronouncements that we'll have an impact in the next year or so.

--000--

MS. WALSH: So with that said, we have assembled an engagement team, where the people at the top of the chart, myself and David, to a lesser extent, but also Linda Hurley who will be our engagement quality control partner, she will do an independent review of the financial statements, are fairly new to the engagement. I

have served in the past five years as the engagement quality review partner, so I'm quite familiar with the financial statements of CalPERS. David is -- this will be his second year serving.

2.4

Now, below that, we have the people who are directing and actually performing the work, Debbie Chan and Heather Jones. They've been on this engagement since the inception of serving you. So this will be their 11th year. So they bring to the table a depth of institutional knowledge, so that we can conduct our audit efficiently and effectively.

Serving them will be some managers and a senior manager, who have collective experience of at least 10 years on the engagement. As part of our audit, we also utilize consulting specialists. We utilize an actuary to help us review actuarial valuations and assumptions.

Marilyn Oliver from Bartel and Associates has been with us for -- this will be her 11th year. And Roger Burton will help us in the health care area, and he's been with us for four years.

So hopefully this demonstrates confidence that we have -- we can plan and perform this audit in accordance with your requirements.

--000--

MS. WALSH: So what is it that we do?

We basically audit your basic financial statements, so what is the set of basic financial statements?

Those constitute your -- the statement themselves, which is the Statement of Fiduciary Net Position, the Statement of Changes in Fiduciary Net Position, and then the Statement of Cash Flows for your enterprise fund operations.

That's -- our opinion is on those basic financial statements. So we will issue an independent auditor's report on them.

What is new this year is we are actually performing our audit in accordance with government auditing standards. What does that mean?

It's an additional level of standard issued by the GAO, the Governmental Accountability Office, that adds a few requirements over and above what the American Institute of Certified Public Accounts requires when performing a financial statement audit.

And one the primary results of that additional audit standard is that we have to issue a report on internal control over financial reporting, and on compliance and other matters. Now, I'm here to tell you that that's not going to change the amount.

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: We have a question.

1 MS. WALSH: Sure.

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Okay. One second.

Mr. Slaton.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Oh, well --

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: I didn't know if you

needed clarification and what --

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: Well, let me come to it very quickly. So back on the organizational chart --

MS. WALSH: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: -- and you talked about the length of time people have worked on the Calpers account.

MS. WALSH: Yes.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: And my experience in overseeing audit from a governance standpoint is that one of the things that becomes of concern is not having people on an account so long that they develop relationships, that, you know, it becomes kind of rote. And so either changing the senior partner, the firm, or the people that are working on it, at least from my background, would say that's a good thing, as opposed to a bad thing.

So can you address this issue of having people who've been working on this for so long at CalPERS in an audit capacity, both the advantages and disadvantages.

MS. WALSH: Well, there's a couple schools of

thought with respect to that is, you know, how long does familiarity breed maybe not the same kind of rigor and independence as one might think? But as far as switching it up, and that's one of the reasons I became the partner on the engagement. I am the new eye. I am the chief quality officer for our firm, so that is what I do primarily. So I certainly look with the keen eye as to what we're doing, and why we're doing it, and how we're doing it.

David Bullock has just become familiar with this engagement last year. Certainly not completely and in-depth familiar, but he brings that perspective too. And then the person who's going to do the independent review of the report is totally not been involved in the engagement.

So what the -- so let's talk about the -- an organization of this size. There is a benefit to the organization for individuals to understand the process, and the controls in place, and understand the people, and the systems. There's a benefit. There's a direct benefit to that.

There's been a lot of discussion in the public arena as to should there be mandatory rotation of audit firms? Should there be mandate -- now, in the State, the State actually passed legislation in 2014 that says if

you're going to audit a local agency, not a State agency, you're going to have to have mandatory partner rotation every six years.

Now, that's going to -- that's a State law. So they felt that the partner rotation was sufficient to counter any of those familiarity threats. Okay.

At the national level, the PCOB, who does the private sector, has talked about that. And they have concluded that it's not appropriate to have mandatory auditor changes. They've done some studies out of the GAO that says if you -- you know, the likelihood of fraud occurring often occurs during the first couple of years a new auditor comes into place, because they're not as familiar with the organization, and they don't know what they're looking for.

So given that, we feel that the depth of the knowledge in the basic understanding of the complexity of the systems at CalPERS, given my oversight, would be sufficient to mitigate that threat. I hope that answers your question.

COMMITTEE MEMBER SLATON: It does. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Thank you.

Mr. Jelincic.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Yeah, I am not a proponent of mandatory rotation of firms. Although, I do

support mandatory rotation of the partner.

But 11 years gives you a lot of knowledge, but it also builds a lot of relationships. If we were talking about 20 years, I think people would clearly be uncomfortable. Where does -- at what point does the value of the experience offset the value of the relationship building, and can that be mitigated by rotating one or the other of those positions?

MS. WALSH: Well, it certainly could be mitigated by that. But remember -- okay, so, like if you're talking about a 20-year span, and you look at the evolution of staff working on an engagement, they come up through the ranks in differing roles, so that after 20 years, or after even 10 or 11 years, you're either going to rotate into a partner position, and then you're going to rotate off the engagement, and then people below you are going to rotate up. So over 20 years you should get that rotation that occurs offhand. People leave all the time, and we have to replace them.

Actually, you've been very fortunate in our practice to have the consistency of the service team, and that doesn't happen all the time.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: So in the not too distant future, we should expect Chan and Jones to become partners and move on, is that what I'm hearing?

30

```
1
             (Laughter.)
             MS. WALSH: Perhaps well put a good word in for
 2
3
    the Deputy Director.
 4
             MS. CHAN: Chan and Jones don't want to become
5
   partners.
6
             No, just kidding.
7
             (Laughter.)
8
             BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Because 11 years -- 11
9
   years is hitting --
10
             MS. WALSH: Heather Jones will -- is a special
11
    situation. She -- we retain her as a technical individual
    who doesn't -- she only works on retirement systems. So
12
13
    she's not like a full-time employee, but Debbie I think
14
    she...
15
             BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: I'm trying to help you,
16
   Debbie.
17
             Thank you.
18
             CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Mr. Lofaso.
19
             ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER LOFASO: Thank you, Madam
20
            I want to take you back to where I think you left
21
    off. And if you hadn't a chance to explain this, I'll
22
    yield, but you were mentioning certain government
23
    standards provided by the Government Accounting Office.
24
    And I was hoping you would compare and contrast those to
25
    the GASB standards. Is one process and one rule based
```

or...

MS. WALSH: Well, okay, so let's differentiate between GASB, which is the accounting standards, and the Governmental Accountability Office issues auditing standards. Those -- we refer to that as government auditing standards. Those stands are predicated and utilized every standard that the AICPA utilizes. And they go one step above. And in the one area, as I mentioned, they require you to report on internal controls and compliance and other matters, and I can talk briefly about that.

They also have a higher threshold for documenting and invaluate -- evaluating independence. And they set forth a bunch of significant threats, and you have to address them in order to mitigate any of those threats. None of those threats exist here, except the familiarity threat, which we talked about that we look at and say here's how we're mitigating that, so...

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER LOFASO: Thank you.

MS. WALSH: You're welcome.

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Please continue.

Please continue.

MS. WALSH: Continue. Okay. So this new -- this new report on internal control over financial reporting and compliance and other matters. So really that's not

going to change the work that we do over internal control. It just requires us to tell you that we've looked at it, we have not audited it, and we do not issue an opinion on your internal control. But that is the report we would communicate any material weaknesses and/or significant deficiencies we've identified during the course of the audit.

The other aspect is reporting on compliance with material -- with laws and regulations that could have a material impact on the financial statements. As part of our audit process now, we certainly look at it. We look at the PERL, we look at other State laws, regulations -- and maybe Debbie you can elaborate on that. And we assure that you're in compliance with that. We've just never reported that, oh -- we don't say you're in compliance, but we say nothing has come to our attention during the course of the audit that there was material noncompliance.

Now, the other matters aspect of it is the government auditing standard says, gosh, if you're doing your audit and you happen to stumble upon abuse, you will so report it to the governance body.

I have yet to see a report that's ever reported abuse. So I'm sure they exist out there. I just haven't personally seen it in our client base. It becomes really difficult for an auditor to make a judgment as to what

abuse is, so...

And also as part of the yellow -- the government auditing standards, there are required communications.

And those are at the outside of the audit, the planning of the audit, which we're doing here, and at the conclusion of the audit. You have already been accustomed to us doing that, so that's not going to be changed.

The other thing we'll do is at the result of the audit, we will -- if we've identified opportunities for enhancing processes, procedures, you've got a deficiency in internal control, but it doesn't rise to the level of material weakness and/or significant deficiency, we will communicate that to you in a management letter.

--000--

MS. WALSH: So what is our responsibility?

So our responsibility is to express an opinion on the fair presentation of your basic financial statements, that they are in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles in the United States.

Here's where I want to just briefly comment.

Management has the primary responsibility for the preparation and fair presentation of the financial statements. They're responsible for the design, implementation, and maintenance of internal control systems that would mitigate the chance of error in

financial statements, whether they're caused by fraud or error.

Now, accompanying the basic financial statements are what we refer to as required supplementary information. Those are not a part of those basic financial statements. They're required by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board to place the financial statements in historical, economic, and operational context. We do not issue an opinion on that information, but we -- we indicate that it's there. And we do apply procedures to it, but we're not going to opine on it.

Those -- the following items are that required supplementary information: The management discussion and analysis, which is before the basic financial statements. That's going to compare this year's operations and last year's operations, and provide who, what, when, and, where. Why did balances change, what caused them, and provide insight into the financial statement reader as an overview of the financial statements.

There's some other schedules that are required by GASB 67. And those are in the back behind the notes to the financial statements. That's the schedule of changes in net pension liability or assets, if that's the case, schedules of plan contributions, schedules of investment

returns, and schedule of claims development information for your health care plan.

Now, that only applies to your single employer plans, and your cost-sharing plans. That information is not applicable to your age of plan.

--000--

MS. WALSH: In addition to that required supplementary information is what we refer to as other supplementary information. And that consists of the schedules that I've outlined here. This is information. In addition, we look at it in relationship to the financial statements and our opinion on those supplemental schedule are in relation to those financial statements.

Now, you prepare, what we call, a comprehensive annual financial report. It includes all the information I just described, but it also has other sections. There's an introductory where you have a transmittal letter from the Executive Director. You have an investment section. You have an actuarial section, and you have a statistical section.

While we read that information, and make sure that there's nothing in that information that contradicts what's in the basic financial statements, we do not audit it and do not issue an opinion on it.

--000--

MS. WALSH: So with that, any questions, before we move on?

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: There are no questions.

MS. CHAN: Thanks, Caroline.

Our audit timeline for this year is consistent with the prior years. We started the audit planning process a few months ago, and we'll continue with this process through the end of October. With respect to field work, we have been on-site for interim work since May. And we'll conclude the interim field work phase in July with the completion of member census data testing.

We'll be back on site in August through October to conduct our year-end testing of the financial statement balances.

We'll issue the draft report in October, and
we'll present our audit results at the November Committee
meeting. Once we receive the signed management
representation letter, we'll issue the signed reports.
And that will be some time in October -- in November.
So that is our timeline, and I'll turn this to

MR. BULLOCK: Thank you.

David to talk about our audit approach.

--000--

MR. BULLOCK: So we've grouped our Audit into three phases, as you can see planning, execution,

reporting. And just for clarification, you know, execution is not as dramatic as it sounds. It's merely the execution of tasks and audit procedures.

So for the planning phase, which Debbie just described as our process right now, we're planning to complete that by the end of this month. That's where we document our understanding of the organization. That's where we look at the internal controls, perform our risk assessments, and we'll talk a little bit more about that on the next slide, and basically complete our audit plan.

And that's the plan that we intend to move forward with at the execution phase of the audit, and then communicate the audit plan to you, and that's what we're doing today.

For the next phase, we'll come out after the -after management has an opportunity to close the books,
and we'll perform our audit procedures, we'll review the
financial statements, look for any subsequent event
disclosures. And then towards the end of that audit,
we'll obtain management representations and organize our
insights for purposes of a management letter.

And then at the conclusion of that, we'll enter the reporting phase. That's where we produce our reports. The first one is our opinion on the financial statements. And that is presented in accordance with GAAP. The second

bullet there is the new report that Caroline had mentioned before, the report on government auditing standards. And that's where we focus on internal controls and compliance with laws and regulations.

And then the next two bullets are required communications at the end, if there are any. We'll communicate any compliance matters or any significant control deficiencies.

And then finally, any other insights that maybe aren't as significant will be reported in the management letter comment.

--000--

MR. BULLOCK: On the next slide, this is where we listed the significant areas that we intend to focus on. These are areas that are significant to the organization, either dollar amounts, or activity. So we'll be looking at the investments and any related income including other balance sheet items that are associated with investments, such as trades receivable and payable, interest and dividend receivables, things of that nature.

We'll focus on the estimated insurance claims liability for the enterprise fund, contributions -- both employer and employee contributions, benefit payments, premium revenue, claims expense, and then the actuarial valuations.

And this is obviously a very significant area. We'll be looking to ensure that those valuations are in accordance with accounting standards and the actuarial standards of practice. We utilize specialists to help us in that area.

The reasonableness of assumptions and methods used to develop the evaluation, any analysis -- or we'll perform analysis of any changes in the discount rate, if this changes from the previous year, and then the member census data. We'll be performing the testing on the census data.

And we utilize the Office of Audit services in past years to help us with that. This year we'll be doing -- performing all those procedures ourselves. And so we'll be going on-site to the various employers and doing a sampling of member census data.

--000--

MR. BULLOCK: On the next slide, we've just outlined some of the responses that we performed in response to our risk assessment. We'll be reviewing generally partner audited financial statements, as we look at those private equities, and utilize our specialists for investment valuations if that's appropriate.

For service organizations, we'll be looking at those -- the reports that are done on those organizations,

such as custodial services, or third-party administrators will be evaluating those reports.

We utilize the data extraction tool for transactions or activities where there's significant volume. And so we'll be utilizing those tools to analyze the benefit payments and contributions. And then finally, we're going to be utilizing specialists to help us evaluate the actuarial valuations for the pension and the health and long-term care.

--000--

MR. BULLOCK: Some of the recent developments with GASB. You know, we talked a little bit about generally accepted accounting principles. It's an evolving set of accounting standards that GASB is constantly retooling and trying to improve.

Some recent pronouncements that will be impacting the organization are the one on fiduciary activities.

GASB felt there was a lot of inconsistency in how organizations are presenting fiduciary activities. And we don't believe this will have a significant impact to Calpers, because it doesn't change the reporting of pension plans and OPEB plans here at Calpers.

But the agency fund that you currently have, the RBF fund, will be -- there will be a significant change to that fund. And the current standard -- the current

standards allow you just to present a balance sheet, if you will, of those agency funds.

And then under the new standards -- oh, question.

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Yeah. We have a question.

Mr. Jelincic

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Yeah, just a quick one.

I've got a number of them I'll come back. But what's RBF?

MS. CHAN: The Replacement Benefit Fund.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Thank you.

MR. BULLOCK: Thank you. We get accustomed to using acronyms, so sorry about that.

And so that will be presenting a -- basically, an income statement, if you will, or statement of flows, a statement of changes in fiduciary net position.

And then GASB Statement 85 is the omnibus statement. And this is where they captured kind of about 10 to 12 different practice issues. It encompass quite a few categories, one of which is investments.

And there was confusion in implementing GASB 72, where preparers were -- different preparers were interpreting the guidance in different ways. And so they just wanted to clarify that investments in money market funds, and certain participating interest-earning investment contracts aren't required to be carried to

amortize costs, but could be, if that was your -- if that was your choice. And then also --

MS. WALSH: And just to clarify, GASB 72 is the fair value standard in that you fair value your investments, and you place them in a level of hierarchy based on the quality of the inputs to estimate those investments.

MR. BULLOCK: Thank you Caroline.

And then the other item we wanted to point out that would have an impact here is just the treatment of employer paid member contributions. And GASB clarified for pension plans that they need to treat the member contributions in the course with the plan terms. And some of the employers were confused. They were -- with presenting it, or there was inconsistencies and they would present member contributions that they were making as their own employer contributions.

And so GASB just wanted to clarify and ensure consistency among reporting of those employer-paid member contributions. So they provide a little bit of guidance on the OPEB.

MS. WALSH: And that would require if an employer picks up an employee share, that is still reported as an employee contribution.

MR. BULLOCK: With that, if we have -- if you

have any questions, we'd be more than happy to answer them.

MS. WALSH: Yeah. That concludes our formal remarks.

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Thank you.

Mr. Lofaso.

2.4

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER LOFASO: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Just on that last point, I hope I'm not walking in a minefield. But I understood there have been some discussions about various legal consequences of whether the employer contribution is employer property or employee property. Does the GASB rule track that exactly or are legal consequences not necessarily related to how you all do the accounting under the GASB rule?

MS. WALSH: Well, there's always a difference between what legal requirements are and what accounting requirements are. When developing and discussing how to more appropriately report this, they did consider whether or not the employer reports it as compensation to the employee under the IRS rules, so -- but they basically concluded for financial reporting, any employer pick up is going to be an employee contribution as it's reported in the financial statements.

ACTING COMMITTEE MEMBER LOFASO: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Mr. Jelincic.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: I have a number of questions, but I heard -- I thought I heard you say that the draft report would be available in November, and the final signed would be in December, and the --

MR. CHAN: The draft report will be available in October, the end of October. And we plan to issue the signed reports in November.

MS. WALSH: I think what typically happens, and maybe you can correct me if I'm wrong, is that that draft report is presented in the November --

MS. CHAN: In November -- correct.

MS. WALSH: At your November meeting. Once you have that presentation and don't have any further comments on it, then it's ready to be issued.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay. So from what the Board will see, it's November -- November and December. From what management gets, it's October and November, is that --

MS. WALSH: I don't know when management distributes it to the Board. We're pretty much done by the end of October.

CHIEF AUDITOR CHAPPUIE: It's presented -- right. We normally receive it from MGO at the end of October just as we're preparing the agenda items for presentation in

November. That's around the same time.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay. So I thank you for that. I have some serious questions about GASB 67 and accounting for investments. The last time I asked the questions it was found to be a violation of Bagley-Keene Act. I understand -- I have put it in writing once again. I understand it's being worked on, and you have seen at least a draft. It hasn't been finalized, so I will defer my questions on that, until I get a chance to see the report.

But I do have some questions about 68. And in your opinion, do you opine on the discount rate used to calculate the liabilities?

MS. WALSH: Well, the opinion is inherent in the fact that we've issued an opinion on the financial statements as a whole. As part of the audit process, we absolutely look at the discount rate and discuss that rate with management and the Finance Office, and also in the Actuarial Office, and the Chief Actuary.

We look at it in the context of what's currently happening, your asset allocation methodology, and then our actuarial specialist also look looks at it. So there's a number of people looking at it. Questions are raised about the appropriateness of that discount rate.

And I just want to caution everybody, the

discount rate used for GASB 68 reporting is and can be necessarily different from the discount rate you use for funding purposes. So we don't look -- we don't care what you're doing with funding, except to the extent that you've already decided that you're going to have a decrement in your funding discount rate, and that is taken into consideration when developing the GASB 68.

We have not -- we have not received the valuation and the testing of that discount rate yet nor have we devoted substantive attention to it at this point in time.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay. So my question is going to be about the process and how you resolve it.

Quoting from the introduction to GASB 68,

"Projected benefit payments are required to be discounted
to their actuarial present value using the single rate
that reflects, one, the long-term expected return of
pension plan assets to the extent that the pension plan's
fiduciary net position is projected to be sufficient to
pay benefits, and pension plan assets are expected to be
invested using a strategy to achieve that return; and two,
a tax exempt high quality municipal bond rate, to the
extent that the conditions for use of the long-term
expected rate of return are not met".

That is from the introduction, but it's also repeated in 31 for single family -- for single employers

and agents, and then somewhere in the 64, 69 for shared costs.

We use -- we have said that our current discount rate is seven and a after. We've announced that we're going to be reducing it. We have a report of the Investment Committee that says the expected return on the portfolio is 5.8. And so how do -- you know, I realize you haven't done it yet, but can you describe the process of how you reconcile those two. I also --

MS. WALSH: Okay. So we look at all available information. And so our current understanding, as confirmed by our controller this morning, is that for purposes of GASB 68, the Actuarial Office has determined that a seven percent rate is appropriate. Now, seven percent needs to be adjusted upwards, because that rate nets admin expenses. And admin expenses are not supposed to be embedded in the rate under GASB 68, so it will be --it will be 7.15 percent as I understand it.

Now, remember, when you're looking at this long-term rate of return, when an actuary looks at it -- I'm not an actuary, but as I understand the process to be, you know, you've got to look in the long term. And the actuarial community is -- they don't define what long term is. That long-term period some actuaries may go out 30 years, some may go 40, some may go 50, some may go 60.

So it depends on the position they take with respect to that. And as long as that's in the framework of the actuarial standards of practice, then, you know, our actuary looks at it and says, gosh, that's reasonable in the circumstance.

Now, if you've got a 5.8 percent asset allocation, really what I would ask is that, is that the long-term expected rate of return, is that some shorter period, or are you talking about long term? And that's the information I really don't know yet.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: And I know that you have just begun this. I also, in the process of going through 68, found an interesting comment in about what's required in the footnotes, and that is to identify the assets, and their expected return for each of the categories. And I don't know that I have seen --

MS. WALSH: I believe it's in there. The asset allocation is in the footnotes.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Okay. I don't know -but not only the allocation but the expected return of
each asset. And I don't remember seeing it in the
footnotes in the past. That's not to say it wasn't there.
It's just I don't remember seeing it, so -- but I will go
back and look.

MS. WALSH: Well, I can find --

49

```
1
             BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: And if it's not, it will
   be there next time.
2
3
             MS. WALSH: The required disclosure requirements
 4
    for that asset allocation is in the footnotes. I can't
5
    tell you which note it is though. Okay.
6
             BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: I can look.
                                                  Thank you.
7
             CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Thank you.
8
             Any other questions?
9
             Okay. I will -- since this is an action item, I
10
   will entertain a motion.
11
             COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Move approval.
12
             CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Okay. So moved by
13
   Mathur --
14
             VICE CHAIRPERSON LIND: Second.
15
             CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: -- seconded by Lind.
16
             All in favor?
17
             (Ayes.)
             CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: So approved.
18
19
             The next item is Item number 8, Enterprise Risk
20
   Management, the Semiannual Enterprise Risk Report that's
21
    an information item only.
22
             CHIEF RISK OFFICER GRIMES: Thank you, Madam
23
    Chair. Forrest Grimes, CalPERS team again.
24
             Good afternoon. I'm now know that I stand in
25
   between you and lunch.
```

(Laughter.)

CHIEF RISK OFFICER GRIMES: And you don't have to be in the risk business to know that that does carry some risk with it.

(Laughter.)

CHIEF RISK OFFICER GRIMES: We're -- the risk team has really been looking forward to this item. And today, we want to walk you through the outcomes of the January Risk Appetite Workshop that you participated in. You may remember that Melissa and Rebecca and myself were there to facilitate discussions, and then you voted on outcomes.

And I want to refer you to page four of attachment 2, and I believe that's page 90 in your iPads. This tells you kind of where we're at in this process. And this goes back to Item 6a as well, when we stated that we were wanting to mature the risk framework this year. You can see where we're at in that process on this page.

And basically, we're in the -- we're around 5:00 o'clock -- I'm sorry, around 3:30 on the right side there, July 17. So that's where we're at, where we're starting from. And basically, you may recall that you voted on the nine of the 10 enterprise risks. And again, we excluded pension funding from the discussion, because we thought that would be better taken up throughout the ALM cycle,

and we think that you're going to be seeing and having those discussions probably in the fall, along with the other ALM work that the Board is doing.

The voting results appear on page -- on page four of attachment 2, and that's 92 of your iPads. And basically, these were taken from the voting results. And this is really what we're here to discuss with you today. If you turn to pages 95 and 96 of your iPads, and that's included as attachment 3 for those in the audience, you will see the statements that we have prepared for your review today.

And with that, we really look forward and welcome your feedback and comments, and would certainly like to include any comments that you have in refining these statements.

With that, I'm going to turn it over to you, Madam Chair. Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Thank you very much.

I see no comments, and being as it's an information item, thank you very much for your report.

And let's see so -- oh, I'm sorry, Mr. Jelincic.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Yeah. On the one of two, 95 of the iPad, attachment 3, the benefit administration. I wonder if we really mean that we will not accept any loss due to internal process errors.

I think we may accept only minimal loss, but to say we will not accept any loss. I don't think that that's really where -- at least it's not where I am. It's not where the Board -- I don't think it's where the Board is. We actually have a process by which we wipe out stuff every year, because it's insignificant and not collectible, or you know, it's minimal.

So as you look at that, I'm not sure any loss is really the right word.

CHIEF RISK OFFICER GRIMES: Thank you for your comment, Mr. Jelincic. You know, I -- if -- can you go back to the wheel diagram.

I think that really this is an iterative process that we're really engaged in together. And if you kind of look at the diagram is the implementation diagram basically. I think that was page 90, right? You'll see that we're going to be having these tradeoff conversations, and that those actually are going to occur between senior management and senior leadership teams throughout the remainder of -- or the first quarter of the next fiscal year.

So when we bring those back to you, back to this Committee in November, I really want to point out that we have always opportunities to refine our views on these things. So Mr. Jelincic's point about any, I think,

really went to Mr. Gillihan's comments during the workshop, which is really to fully engage, I think, to the next level of maturity. We're going to have to really have some trade-off conversations. And I think that we will, but I just want to point out that we're really working through maturing this framework.

BOARD MEMBER JELINCIC: Thank you. CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Thank you.

Ms. Mathur.

2.4

COMMITTEE MEMBER MATHUR: Yeah. No, I just wanted to say that I think these -- you've captured well sort of the discussion that we had at the off-site with these risk appetite statements. It is still hard to fully appreciate what each of them means in practice. And I guess it will be tested if situations arise. But, to me, this generally does capture where I was and where the discussion led us.

So I thank you for putting this together. And it's very -- I mean, this is very challenging and sort of new territory to come up with these risk appetite statements, but I think you landed on something good.

Thank you.

CHIEF RISK OFFICER GRIMES: Thank you very much.

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Thank you.

And I just have a suggestion regarding cyber

risks that maybe at some future time, we go through a tabletop exercise of a cybersecurity event, just to highlight the practice that we would -- that the Board would need to go through, if an event were to occur. And that would just be a suggestion for the future.

Well, that concludes the semiannual enterprise risk report.

Ms. Timberlake-D'Adamo, I don't know that I heard any Summary of Committee direction, did you?

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

11 D'ADAMO: I did not, other than what you just said.

12 CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Yeah, other than what I
13 just said.

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE

D'ADAMO: Do you want to make that a Committee direction

or --

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Yeah, my Board Members, would you like that tabletop, just so we've gone through -- yeah, at the off-site, just so -- yeah, so that would be --

INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE
D'ADAMO: So a discussion around cyber --

CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Well, just a -- how we would react -- at an off-site. Yeah, not this one, but just what a cybersecurity event to highlight the practice

and, you know, what the Board would need to do in the were event likely to occur. INTERIM CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER TIMBERLAKE D'ADAMO: Okay. CHAIRPERSON HOLLINGER: Okay. The Risk and Audit Committee is now adjourned. Thank you. (Thereupon the California Public Employees' Retirement System, Board of Administration, Risk & Audit Committee open session meeting adjourned at 12:14 p.m.)

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand
Reporter of the State of California, do hereby certify:

That I am a disinterested person herein; that the foregoing California Public Employees' Retirement System,
Board of Administration, Risk & Audit Committee open
session meeting was reported in shorthand by me, James F.
Peters, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of
California;

That the said proceedings was taken before me, in shorthand writing, and was thereafter transcribed, under my direction, by computer-assisted transcription.

I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 26th day of June, 2017.

fames & Potter

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR
Certified Shorthand Reporter
License No. 10063